

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held on the 1st Floor in the Boardroom, Protea
Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town,
at 09h00 on Wednesday, 6 June 2018.**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Mr Chris Snelling (CSn), opened the meeting at 09H02 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)
Prof Lucien le Grange (LLG)
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)
Mr Siphwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ) (co-opted)

Staff

Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Mr Andrew September (AS)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Mr Zethembe Khuluse (ZK)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Ms Yolanda Moya (YM)

Observers

None

Visitors

Dr Stephen Townsend (ST)	Mr Richard Summers (RS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)	Ms Clarice Arendse (CA)
Ms Ursula Rigby (UR)	Ms Teresa Thanson (TT)
Mr Mark Hibbert (MH)	Ms Constance Pansegrouw (CP)
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (BOD)	Mr Peter Büttgens (PB)
Mr Andrew Berman (AB)	Mr Andre Pentz (AP)
Mr Trevor Thorold (TT)	Mr Zane De Decker (ZDD)
Mr William Whittaker (WW)	Mr Neil Franks (NF)
Mr Wynand Schabort (WS)	Ms Danjelle Midgley (DM)
Mr Jankel Nieuwoudt (JN)	Mr Pierre Swanepoel (PS)
Mr Tinus Potgieter (TP)	Mr Ton Veen (TV)

3. Apologies

Mr Guy Thomas (GT)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 6 June 2018 with amendments.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

- 5.1 The Committee resolved to approve the minutes dated 9 May 2018 with minor amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- 6.1 None

7. Confidential Matters

- 7.1 None

8. Appointments

- 8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals Committee, Tribunal and Court Cases

PM reported on the following appeals matters:

- Proposed Partial Demolition, Erf 680258 and 116379, 4 and 6 Smithers Road, Kenilworth: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 1487, 15 Davenport Road, Vredehoek: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 1489, 12 Bradwell Road, Vredehoek: Section 34
- Proposed Alteration, Additions & Partial Demolition of Erf 419, Longmarket Street, Stanford Village: Section 31
- Proposed Total Demolition - Erf 551, 4 Oliver Road, Sea Point: Section 34

9.2 Prof Fabio Todeschini

Members of the Committee shared their memories of Prof Fabio Todeschini, who passed away on 22 May 2018.

His contribution to not just the IACom, but his work in respect of the understanding of heritage, the cultural landscape, city and place making, in Cape Town, the Western Cape, South Africa and internationally was seminal. He will be sorely missed.

The Committee agreed that a minute's silence for Prof Todeschini, prior to hearing the first item, would be an appropriate way of paying respect.

His chair was kept open for the duration of the meeting.

9.3 Public Participation and Comments

Procedure was discussed. There was still a degree of confusion in respect of Bullet 5 of the previous minutes.

The procedure should be as follows:

1. Comment period for a Draft Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), prepared for comment, is 30 days.
2. Once the comment period has closed, the Heritage Practitioner responsible for compiling the HIA responds to comments received, (if applicable), and the HIA is finalised.

3. The Heritage Practitioner sends a copy of the completed HIA, (which includes comments previously received, responses to those comments and any additional information) to ALL identified Interested and Affected Parties (I&Aps) for information, and notifies the identified I&Aps of the anticipated date on which the HIA will be considered by IACom.
4. The completed HIA, (which is the same document that has been circulated to I&Aps for information), must be submitted to HWC a minimum of three weeks prior to the IACom meeting, and proof of the HIA being sent to identified I&Aps for their noting must be included with the submission.
5. Additional comment or information, by identified I&Aps (which does not reflect information already submitted), resulting from consideration of the completed HIA must be submitted to HWC, and copied to the applicant, a week prior to the date of the meeting. No comment received after this date will be accepted, unless with the express agreement of all parties concerned. Alternately I&Aps have the opportunity to address the Committee on the day at which the matter will be heard.

9.4 Committee Workshop

The Committee workshop, initially planned for June, was postponed to August. Date to be advised.

9.5 Farm Sense De Lieu, Paarl

The Final Basic Assessment Report was discussed by email and the e-mail decision ratified.

During e-mail circulation, Prof Todeschini wished to record his objection to the proposal and resultant urban sprawl within an identified Grade III cultural landscape and, as such he abstained from the decision.

The Committee endorsed the Interim Comment previously made and resolved to issue a Final Comment, which reflects the decision previously taken and all conditions imposed.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved to support the findings and recommendations contained in the HIA and the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), provided that:

The development shall be substantially in accordance with the layout described in the HIA report as Alternative 1b, and the associated Landscape Master Plan dated 22 February 2017; Landscape Master Plan & Landscape Design Motivation dated February 2017; and Sense de Lieu Draft Architectural Design Guidelines as appended to the HIA Report and as amended by the mitigation measures included in the HIA Report);

The mitigation measures described in the HIA report are implemented in full in all respects. These are as follows:

Height and Scale of Buildings

- Articulated, simple rectangular forms are characteristic of rural buildings, and this typology should inform the development proposal.

- Building heights should be limited to a maximum of two storeys on the southern portion of the site, but preferably single and loft type accommodation (6m height) along the entire length of the R301 as well as the eastern edge of the site.

Massing and Aggregation of Buildings.

- Locate higher density buildings on the lower portion of the site (south to south-west corner) and locate lower density buildings on the higher lying areas (north to north-east).
- Set-back new structures beyond 30m of the edge of the R301, allowing a landscape 'buffer' strip to preserve the sense of openness travelling towards Franschoek. Not more than 40% of this buffer strip should be used for parking.
- Landscape and Building Integration
- Establish traditional patterns of planting where appropriate with suitable species. The underlying purpose must be to weave into the existing landscape pattern, rather than to displace it with a new pattern.
- Landscaping of the development, such that rural scenic features and landscape patterns such as tree lined streams / drainage lines, tree belts and clumps (exotic and indigenous where appropriate) must be created to tie the proposed development into its rural landscape. To this end a Registered Landscape Architect is to be appointed to prepare a landscape plan and is to be retained to ensure this landscaping is implemented to standard.

Texture & Colour

- Muted tones and 'earth colours' are more subtle and are more easily absorbed (visually) than bright or highly reflective surfaces. Suitable colours include grey, olive green, ochre, brown, etc. – refer to on-site geology/rock/soil and vegetation types for reference.
- Rough/textured surfaces are preferable to shiny/highly reflective surfaces in terms of visual absorption (minimize reflection/ glare/shine).
- Roadways should resemble 'farm roads' – (if not gravel then exposed aggregate rather than asphalt).
- Architectural guidelines should be drawn up to ensure that a local modern, rural type building style is developed with appropriate materials being used to reduce visual impact.

Edge Conditions

- Consider 'dissolving' buildings into farmland through a subtle transition from building platform to landscape context, at the dwelling scale. Use screen/shade planting to soften the interface.
- Berm and dam features may be incorporated in a manner that is sensitive to natural landform. Views towards the mountains should be maintained. Indigenous vegetation, consistent with (but not exclusively of) the original vegetation unit, ought to be integrated as a biodiversity corridor.
- Tree planting should be used to mitigate visibility from the R301, however, formal avenues of trees are not recommended along the R301, except if arranged in an orchard pattern. Informal clusters of trees and large shrubs can also be considered. Tree planting should not block out views to Klein Drakenstein Mountains.
- The interface with the R301 is of critical importance to maintain a sense of rural quality within the local context. The boundary treatments must be visually permeable, using fencing for the most part and walls at entrances only. No

precast concrete walls should be allowed on the site. No boundary wall or fence should be permitted along the R301 boundary.

Lighting Conditions

- Avoid light 'pollution' by reducing lighting to the minimum necessary. Lighting is to be discrete, and well-integrated into the design proposal
- Naked light sources must not be visible outside the area of the site
- Light sources must be shielded to reduce light spillage
- Up-lighting onto the outer sides of the buildings must be used sparingly
- Shielded down-lights must be used on all open public areas
- Neon or unshielded bright security lights may not be used
- No spotlights should be allowed (only motion sensor security lighting where absolutely necessary)
- Along the site boundary, lighting may be permitted at the entrance gateways only – but not along the length of the R301. To preserve the rural quality, no freestanding lamp standards are to be installed within the development. Instead, lighting should be provided by low level bollards (i.e. not exceeding 900mm height) or via luminaires affixed to the buildings themselves - subject to the normal cautionary regarding naked light sources.

To accompany the development proposal, the following drawings should be developed in terms of the planning, design and detail considerations described in this report:

Landscape Development Plan (prepared by a registered Professional Landscape Architect) – indicating the position and hierarchy of all public open spaces as well as tree planting.

- indicating the proposed soft landscaping treatment of the 30m wide buffer strip interface with the R301 including a detailed section (minimum 1:100),
- indicating suggested plant species list for trees, shrubs and groundcovers (including total areas, planting-out sizes and planting-out ratios),
- details of proposed security / boundary treatment (visually transparent, welded mesh fence recommended – no continuous solid masonry walls – rather visually permeable, non-obtrusive farm fences),
- details of proposed footways (including suggested materials),
- indication of lighting and signage and / or (discreet) way-finding system – positions to be included on plan,
- Storm water strategy (open, planted channels and swales recommended), and
- details of parking including screening (berming / planting – again no kerbs, paving of parking to reflect in-situ soil colours, include list of suggested materials).

Mitigation required during the various phases of development in addition to the aforesaid are listed as follows:

Construction phase:

- Careful environmental management measures should be enacted to prevent damage to surrounding soil, vegetation and drainage lines.
- Dust control measures should be put in place.
- The use of heavy machinery should be minimized to prevent scarring and erosion of the site, and cut and fill operations should be minimized.

Operational phases:

- Although the proposed buildings need to be further developed in terms of typology criteria within their landscape context, additional landscaping and screen planting will reduce the visual impact further, and help to settle and anchor the new buildings into their context. Screen and shade planting will also help to reduce the visibility of buildings, and to provide a greater degree of privacy.
- Careful consideration should be applied to the parking of vehicles – as far as possible visiting vehicles should be parked in the shade, or screened behind berms or hedges, to prevent reflected glare from wind shields.
- Parking areas should be unobtrusive and surfaced with exposed aggregate rather than asphalt or clay brick.

HB

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections

None.

10.2 Report back from ExCo, Council and other Committees

The Chairperson presented feedback from the EXCO meeting held on 18th May. Committee noted the feedback.

CSn

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

11 SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(1) INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Proposed Mixed Use Development on Erven 9333, 1451-1455 and 1466-1469 (Goldies), Cape Town: MA
HM\CASES\CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN\CITY CENTRE CBD\ERF 9333, 1451-1455 AND 1466-1469**

Case No: 17072534WD0726M

Heritage Impact Assessment with Archaeology, Preliminary Cityscape and Urban Design Indicators were tabled.

A minute's silence was observed in remembrance of Professor Todeschini before discussion of the item began.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay provided a brief PowerPoint introduction.

Dr Stephen Townsend, Mr Richard Summers, Mr Mike Scurr, Ms Clarice Arendse and Ms Ursula Rigby were present and took part in the discussion.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The grading of the warehouse and chimney was accepted by all parties as being of high local significance and a grading of IIIA for both was endorsed. It was noted that the chimney, unlike in previous iterations, was now to remain *in situ*.
- In submissions, Dr Townsend argued that the townscape, falling within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ), must be regarded as a Heritage Resource and that furthermore the skyline must be considered as part of the townscape. It cannot be looked at as a separate entity.
- The HIA had argued that the skyline is not something that should be controlled by Heritage Western Cape.
- The Committee accepted that the Townscape is regarded as a heritage resource, (indeed the HIA itself accepted that the area in which the development is proposed must be considered as part of the HPOZ and not excised from it as had been previously argued). Furthermore the committee agreed that the skyline is part of the Townscape and must be regarded as a heritage resource.
- Discussion was held as to whether the HIA had adequately addressed the townscape as a heritage resource. Primary points of concern in this regard were noted as being how the building meets the ground, (the bottom 35m or so), as well as how the height of the building transitions from other tall buildings, both existing and under construction, within the immediate context.
- A number of wider issues arose in the context of the discussion, which were tabled for the record. The Committee noted:
 - The provision of parking within new developments in the City has led to an increase in height; the problem being that parking is bulk free in terms of the provisions of the City's By-law. As such, in order to maximise profits, a good number of lower level floors are devoted to parking, and this has repercussions in respect of height, detailing and form of the building following function.
 - The provisions of s.38(1)(c)(i),(ii), and (iii), of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) were specifically included in the Act in recognition of the potential detrimental impact of consolidation of, or within, a City block and resultant built form in respect of the loss of historic grain, scale and texture, (all highly important components which contribute to the significance of the townscape), to future development. The provision of parking within the lower floors of new buildings has invariably led to the loss of the historic grain, scale, and texture within the townscape, and has often led to a 'dishonest' architectural response with superficial facades being applied to buildings to try and address this.
- There appears to be no meaningful City policy in respect of height, throughout the City. Whereas some 30 years ago or so, (which coincides with the time that Urban Conservation, (Heritage), Areas were first mooted), the City of Cape Town was in the process of developing an appropriate height policy that looked at the City holistically. The City was concerned with good place-making and townscape conservation. This appears to have been lost and is no longer a priority. Development is now largely guided by the provisions of the Municipal Planning By-Law and zoning provisions, (in itself considered wrongly as "rights"), and an often ineffective Tall Building Policy: Heritage, urban design, or townscape

- considerations, are very often reduced to trying to mitigate impact of development on the townscape as a heritage resource, rather than guiding development.
- In respect of the proposed building itself, the following was noted:
 - a. It was generally accepted by the Committee that a tall building is appropriate in this location. The Committee also accepted that regulation of the skyline as part of the townscape is a heritage response, and without necessarily limiting the height of the building to below that as is proposed, it was agreed that a better transition in height between the adjacent Portside building, 16 on Bree, (under construction), and the proposed building should be investigated.
 - b. It was felt that the current base of the building is not that well resolved as a response to the townscape and that the 35m “datum” could be better expressed, in particular looking up the Buitengracht towards the mountain. The response needs to be a three rather than two dimensional one, in how this level is expressed. Likewise, the building needs to be properly resolved or detailed where it meets the ground and should acknowledge historic cadastrals, grain and texture. This may assist in the warehouse building, which is being retained, not being overwhelmed.
 - All parties were in agreement that the level of detail at ground level does need to be addressed. Furthermore, it was also acknowledged in the HIA itself, that the level of detailing required in respect of where the proposed building interacts with the roof of the warehouse and how the “winter garden” is resolved is not yet at a stage which could warrant approval. Whilst noting that the enclosing of the chimney within a roofed urban square would effectively render the former landmark, and now hidden chimney, an artefact, it was accepted in principle that significance would not be lost.
 - It was resolved that instead of taking a formal decision with conditions in respect of the application, that in order to ensure the minimal adverse impact on heritage resources, it would be preferable to provide an interim comment that gives a degree of comfort to the applicant but ensures that the various aspects commented on, and design detail requested, is submitted to the committee for final approval.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee agreed that a tall building, within a cluster of tall buildings, is appropriate in this location. In this regard, the Committee does not reject the proposed height of the building in principle. It was however noted that there must be a meaningful transition in height between the Portside Building, 16 on Bree, and the proposed development itself.

The relationship of the base of the building, to the surrounding townscape needs to be addressed, and in particular, its response to the Buitengracht, the Portside Building, how it meets the ground, as well as its relationship to the Warehouse, (which currently appears overwhelmed, between the proposed development and 16 on Bree).

How the proposed columns of the building interact with the warehouse, as well as the treatment to the enclosed “winter garden” and area surrounding the chimney in order to maintain and not detract from their significance, requires more detailed resolution before a final decision can be taken.

WD

**13.2 Proposed Total Demolition of three Buildings, Consolidation and Development of a Four Storey Building on Erven 31751; Erven 31752; Erven 150019, Alma Road and York Lane, Rosebank: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ROSEBANK/ERVEN 31751; ERVEN 31752;
ERVEN 150019**

Case No: 17111605ZK1122E

GJ was co-opted for this item.

Section 38(4) application documents and Final Integrated Heritage Impact Assessment were tabled.

Dr Stephen Townsend, Mr Trevor Thorold, Mr Andrew Berman, Mr Andre Pentz, Mr Zane De Decker, Mr William Whittaker, Mr Neil Franks, Mr Wynand Schabort and Ms Danjelle Midgley were present and took part in the discussion.

Mr Zethembe Khuluse introduced the item.

The issue of public participation and comment received was discussed, and representation was made by both applicants and appellants. There was still a degree of confusion in regard to how HWC deals with comment received after the formal comment period has ended, and the HIA has been finalized. It was agreed that the matter be heard.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the area in which the proposed development is located, falls within a proposed HPOZ. The Committee accepted that this area is of heritage significance. Although the area has not been formally declared yet, it had been identified, and proposed, as an Urban Conservation Area by the Urban Conservation Unit of the City's Town Planning Branch some 25 years ago. Given that it is known to be an environment that is of heritage significance, it is concerning that the City has still not taken steps to formally protect it.
- The Committee noted that two of the buildings earmarked for demolition have been identified as Grade IIIC Heritage Resources. There was general agreement that the two structures were not of great intrinsic significance in themselves, but that they did contribute to the character of the area which has heritage significance. However, it was agreed that if consent for their demolition was to be granted, then any replacement structure(s) *must* take the character of the proposed HPOZ into account and likewise contribute to, and not detract from, the heritage related qualities inherent in the HPOZ.
- The Committee was not opposed to the notion of densification in the particular locale of the site, or consolidation of the three erven per se, and agreed that a larger structure could indeed better define the gateway into the proposed HPOZ. (It was disagreed that this was a node, as had been argued).
- However, such structure must draw from the good precedent of larger scaled buildings found within the HPOZ, (the two-storey blocks of flats located in nearby Pillans Road and York Road being two such examples), and not borrow from, or use bad precedent within the proposed HPOZ, or across Liesbeek Parkway as motivation.
- The Committee strongly disagreed with the argument presented of the western edge of the proposed HPOZ being eroded as a motivation for the scale and nature of the structure as proposed. The Committee disagreed with the notion

that this edge was eroded in the first place, and noted that even if it were eroded, the aim of sensitive design within a heritage context, should be to attempt to stitch the edge back together and not use it as motivation for a development model that would exacerbate such erosion.

- The Committee noted that there had been over 200 objections to the proposed development, including from the City of Cape Town's Heritage Resources Section, as well as the Rosebank and Mowbray Planning and Aesthetics Committee, amongst others. It was considered surprising that the applicant and the applicant's consultants had not appeared to take any of the comment on board and take steps to reassess the significance of the area or amend the design accordingly. It appeared as if the HIA had been conducted in order to motivate for a preconceived development model, rather than assisting in informing an appropriate development model that the heritage context would warrant.
- The Committee did not consider the HIA to have complied with the provisions of s.38(3)(b) and (c) of the NHR Act.
- It was felt that the HIA had not adequately assessed, described, or understood, the qualities of the proposed HPOZ. This was self-evident in many of the arguments presented in motivation for the structure itself being appropriate in this locale. As a result of this, it was also felt that the assessment of the impact of the development on identified heritage resources was flawed.
- It was also noted that the provisions of s.38(3)(f) had not been complied with. In accepting that both structures located on the site were Grade IIIC heritage resources, their potential demolition alone, in addition to the site's location within a heritage context, should have warranted the consideration of alternatives. No alternatives have been provided in the report.
- Notwithstanding it was noted that the provisions of s.38(3) had not been complied with, the following observations were made in respect of the proposed development itself in order to provide the applicant with future guidance if required.
- The proposed development model was considered as flawed for a number of reasons:
 - a. The architectural form was considered as being alien to the character of the proposed HPOZ. Even the old age home site opposite, noted as being part of the so-called eroded edge, provided a building model which had a solid ground floor and had a roof form and scale which could be argued to have some consistency with the character of the area.
 - b. The proposed model is effectively a four storey building consisting of a ground level of parking and three floors above, situated on concrete columns. The ridge of the roof forms a continuous line and the ends of the block that meet the adjacent single residential development, make no effort at stepping down. The facades show very little articulation and the roofs have no overhanging eaves. The top floor of the building appears to be clad in roofing material in an attempt to disguise it as being part of a roof. There is no precedent for this built form anywhere in the proposed HPOZ on the northern edge of Alma Road, in which the proposal is located. It will, in the opinion of the Committee, negatively impact on heritage resources, the primary one being the heritage environment within which it is located.
- In the light of the above, the Committee resolved not to support the application in its current form and noted that the HIA does not meet the requirements of s.38(3) of the NHRA.
- The applicants were consulted as to whether they would prefer an outright Decision, (which would invoke their right to appeal), or receive an Interim

Comment, which would allow them to reconsider the development proposal and revise the HIA, without having to make a new application to HWC. The applicants chose the latter option and the Committee agreed to this, on the condition that all parties who had expressed an interest in the matter, (i.e. those who had submitted letters or comment to the heritage consultants), are to be given the opportunity to comment on the new, or revised HIA, and proposed development, as the case may be.

INTERIM COMMENT

At present, the HIA does not fulfil the requirements of s38 (3) of the NHR Act. These include:

1. Neither an adequate analysis, and assessment, of the character of the heritage environment within which the proposal is located, nor an adequate assessment of the impact of the development on heritage resources as required in terms of s38(3)(b) and (c) of the NHRA, was provided.
2. The consideration of alternatives, should heritage resources be adversely affected by the proposed development, as required in terms of s.38(3)(f) of the NHRA, was not provided.

The proposed development in its present form is considered to impact negatively on the character of the proposed HPOZ and other heritage resources identified, which include two IIIC buildings on the site itself.

A revised HIA must be submitted to all identified Interested and Affected Parties for comment. The 30 day comment period applies.

ZK

13.3 Proposed Development, Erven 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695 and 177761, 11 and 13 Sea Street, 13 and 13a Loop Street, Corner Loop, Riebeek and Sea Street, Cape Town CBD: NM HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CAPE TOWN CBD/ ERVEN 692, 1693, 1694, 1695 AND 177761

Case No: 17111302WD1129M

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay gave a brief introduction and Mr Pierre Swanepoel from DHK Architects gave a presentation.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue, Ms Ursula Rigby, Mr Peter Büttgens, Mr Jankel Nieuwoudt and Mr Pierre Swanepoel were present and took part in the discussion.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Although it was accepted that this is a different application, which has to be assessed on its own merits, the Committee noted that much of the comment made in respect of the Goldies proposal, was equally applicable in this instance and primarily related to the provision of parking and the resultant impact this has at podium level.
- There was some confusion noted in the documentation provided as to the actual height of the proposed building. It was confirmed that the proposed height of the

building was in fact 88.5m from base level. Any other heights indicated in the documentation should be corrected.

- In general, the proposed height of the building was not felt to be a concern in this location. The primary concern was around how the building meets the ground and the 9 ½ storeys of sterile facade, resultant from the provision of above-ground parking. The heritage consultants also noted that the articulation of the base was the foremost concern, including its relationship to the scale of adjoining streetscapes, particularly along Loop Street, and along Sea Street.
- It was felt that the HIA needed to go into further depth in respect of the analysis of adjoining streetscapes and the greater townscape in which it is located. This block is one of the few remaining blocks where the historic subdivisions are still expressed, and contains several significant buildings older than 100 years, as well as some introduced in the 20th Century, (one of which may be an important Modernist building). Whilst the structures on the site may be of lesser intrinsic significance, they do contribute to the overall historic grain of the block and should be viewed as an important component of the block's, (and the Central City's), layering.
- It was also noted that Sea Street, is a significant heritage resource, and is of a particularly fine scale and quality along its western edge. There was very little analysis of this streetscape in the HIA, or indeed assessment of the impact of the base of the building facing onto it. It was noted that more and more of the small lanes which were once highly characteristic components of the historic urban footprint, are being lost, or incrementally swallowed by development, as is the case with Sea Street (lane) where it is badly impacted by the Safmarine House development.
- Whilst it is generally accepted that the indicators in the report are well summarized, it is not clear as to how they were derived, and furthermore there appears to be a disconnect between the indicators and their architectural interpretation and translation. The architectural response of the base of the building appears to be a two-dimensional applied reference in response to certain identified datum lines, heights etc. rather than a meaningful expression reflecting function in combination with a response to context.
- It was noted that there is older fabric present on the site, noted in Sea Street, and that the possibility (or lack thereof) of archaeological impacts has not been addressed. Given that there would be foundations being dug to support a new structure, and given the location of the site in an historic part of the city close to its former waterfront, an archaeological screening report, at the least, should be included in the HIA.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee awaits a revised HIA and building design, which has taken into account the above comments by the Committee.

WD

**13.4 Conservation Management Plan for Amsterdam Battery on Erven 149294 & 9588, V&A Waterfront: MA
HM/WATERFRONT/ERVEN 149294 AND 9588**

Case No: 15110515GT1110E

The matter was removed from the agenda.

WD

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

16.1 None

17 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

17.1 None

18 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT

18.1 None

19 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT

19.1 None

20 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

20.1 None

21 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT

21.1 None

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23. SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES

23.1 None

24 SECTION 42 – HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. OTHER/ ADVICE

25.1 None

26 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

26.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

27. CLOSURE – 15:00

28. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 11 July 2018

CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE** _____

SECRETARY _____ **DATE** _____